

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-04314A000100120001-6

4 December 1961

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Position Analysis Survey of Operations School

REFERENCES : (A) Position Descriptions, Forwarded by PO/TR
22 November 1961

(B) Memorandum for Director of Training from
Director of Personnel, dated 3 October
1961, Subject: "Survey of Office of
Training"

(C) [REDACTED] Subject: "Position Analysis",
dated 31 March 1954

25X1A

25X1A6a

25X1A6a

1. Under Reference A, the undersigned received on 24 November twenty position descriptions for the fifty-five present positions in the Operations School. These positions include those filled at Headquarters (including [REDACTED] and in the Covert Training installation in [REDACTED]. The instructions on the routing sheet of Reference A reflect oral conversations between the Office of Personnel and the Personnel Officer of the Office of Training and read as follows:

"Attached are position descriptions prepared by the Salary and Wage Division, Office of Personnel as a result of the recent survey of the Office of Training. Please review each description and sign Section II, B if you concur that it is a complete and accurate description of the position. If you do not concur, please attach a separate statement to this effect giving the reasons for your non-concurrence.

"Your concurrence does not mean that you agree with the evaluation of the position at a specific grade level, but only that you agree that it is a complete and accurate description of the current duties of the position. Please return these descriptions to PO/TR by 8 December 1961."

This document is part of an Integrated file. If separated from the file it must be
filed in the original system after review.

Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-04314A000100120001-6

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-04314A000100120001-6

2. Reference B transmitted "survey reports" for the Operations School and Covert Training and includes the following statement:

"The variety of positions under study and the difficulty of finding adequate comparisons in this survey has made it necessary for us to make tentative analyses and evaluations in some cases. I know you will appreciate, therefore, that the results outlined in the attached report are not final. As soon as you and appropriate members of your staff have had an opportunity to review the report, representatives of the Salary and Wage Division will meet with you to discuss the proposed actions and to consider what further action may be appropriate. In the event that effective and practicable solutions cannot be reached through such discussions, I will be glad to discuss the details with you in order that we may achieve the soundest possible results."

3. Reference C "states Agency policy and procedures with respect to obtaining and recording basic occupational information about Agency positions," and is the underlying authority for the exercise, the available results of which are reflected in References A and B.

4. Because I do not see how without further direction to carry out the review requested by Reference A, it is necessary to state the following:

a. For almost eight years, Reference C has authorized the conduct of position analyses for the purpose stated in that Regulation. Even after such an extensive continuous practice, it might well be possible to question at this time the utility of position analyses to an organization such as the Operations School. Perhaps such a basic question could be raised on the occasion of the prospective revision of Reference C. However, for the purposes of the comments that follow it will be assumed that position analysis as described in Reference C is a useful exercise for this School at this time.

b. Paragraph 2.b. of Reference C defines "Position Description" as: "A current and accurate statement of the duties and responsibilities, general information, and evaluation factors, including qualification requirements existing within a given position..." The position descriptions forwarded under Reference A for the 55 positions in the Operations School are not accurate in the following major respects:

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-04314A000100120001-6

~~SECRET~~

(1) Many individual position descriptions do not state that the incumbent "performs other related duties assigned," or some such generalized statement to cover the many unpredictable and recurrent tasks levied on Operations School personnel. However, some individual position descriptions do so state.

(2) Broad general statements in some individual position descriptions give an air of certainty, specificity, and permanence, where in fact the duties and responsibilities involved are uncertain and changing. For example, the description of position #U-647 states that the incumbent is responsible for "continuously monitoring and evaluating training programs to ensure that training objectives and standards are being met," whereas the incumbent is in fact currently engaged in the preliminary task of trying to agree with officials of the DDP as to what training objectives and standards should be, and then in keeping them constantly under review for necessary updating.

(3) Certain basic duties and responsibilities are not stated, for example: the requirement for every Operations School employee to live the personal cover which he may have and the institutional cover of the subordinate organization in which he serves.

(4) Many job descriptions do not establish the basis for the experience, knowledge, skills, abilities and education nor physical demands and personal characteristics required to perform the duties involved.

c. Among the twenty separate position descriptions received, there is internal inconsistency in that some list (under Item 6) as the reason for submission "Classification Survey," whereas others do not list any reason. Although it is obvious from the related correspondence (viz. Reference B) that the purpose in each case is classification survey, any individual position description where this fact is not so indicated might mean that the position description taken alone could be misunderstood to involve a change of duties, a change of Table of Organization, or a change in existing grade structure.

d. The twenty individual position descriptions do not follow the same format and in no case follow the complete format set forth in the Figure I attached to Reference C. Some of the twenty descriptions contain only Section I "Duties and Responsibilities" and II "Supervision Received;" whereas others include: I "Job Summary," II "Duties and Responsibilities," III "Supervisory Controls" and IV "Special Considerations."

e. Minimum qualification requirements (as exemplified by Section III of Figure I annexed to Reference C) are not set forth in any of the twenty position descriptions, unless those position descriptions which contain a Section IV "Special Considerations" can be equated with subparagraph 6 ("Special Qualifications") of Section III of Figure I of Reference C.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-04314A000100120001-6

f. In the absence of qualification requirements set forth as part of position descriptions, an incumbent or supervisor concurring in the completeness and accuracy of the description of a position is doing so without having available that which is stated in Reference C to be an integral part of that description. It would be possible to concur in the position descriptions as presented under Reference A without agreeing to separate qualification requirements, in the same way that such concurrence would not have to mean agreement with separate evaluation of the position at a specific grade level. But so to concur would mean to concur as though Reference B did not exist, when it does exist and indeed sets forth not only recommended grade levels but also narrative "evaluation statements" which come close to being "qualification requirements" without specifically so indicating. For example, Reference A states for position #U1414 a Job Summary, Duties and Responsibilities, Supervisory Controls, and Special Considerations, but does not indicate the grade or qualification requirements other than to state (under Special Considerations): "This position may be filled by either OTR or DD/P personnel. Incumbents are required to have up-to-date knowledge of clandestine intelligence operations based on field experience. In order to meet this requirement OTR personnel are required to rotate to the DD/P periodically. DD/P personnel filling the position are normally assigned to OTR for a three-year tour upon completion of which they are reassigned to the DD/P area." About this same position, Reference B includes the following "evaluation statement": "The position compares favorably with the GS-14 Chief Instructor positions in the School of Foreign Affairs, Department of State." It would seem invalid to make evaluations on the basis of comparison with other services when the job descriptions themselves often indicate requirements not present in such other services.

g. The report of the survey of the Operations School repeatedly attempted to line up the instructors in various groups under a chief instructor, and then, more or less arbitrarily, set down the number of employees to be in each grade under each chief instructor. The nature of the work in the Operations School precludes the establishment of grades based on the employee's title. That the Chief Instructor position shall always be a higher grade than the Instructor position is an erroneous postulate in our situation. Just as a university will import a man expert in his field to teach a given subject, and perhaps pay him a larger salary than the department head because of his special knowledge, so must the Operations School pay an operations officer for his skill in operational activities, without regard to the grades of others on the staff either above or below him in the chain of command. Our work requires men who have had high level operational experience, and these men have high grades.

5. If position analyses of the 55 positions of the Operations School are to be reviewed for the purpose of concurrence or stated non-concurrence, then I submit that this task can only be intelligently performed if the complete position descriptions (including qualification requirements) and the resulting suggested grades are reviewed as a unit,

Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-04314A000100120001-6

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

job by job, and then all jobs reviewed together in terms of the School's tasks. The only alternative would be to proceed, in order, by first agreeing as to the precise description of the job, then going to the qualification requirements, then going to the grade resulting in each case, and then taking up the entire unit. In the present exercise, I am asked to do each of these four steps in separate and unrelated exercises, and I am presented with materials on each of these subjects which are internally inconsistent one with the other and which in their entirety do not implement the procedures established by Regulation. This is especially the case in appraising the overall conclusions as to grades and slots for the School as a whole, in which appraisal the changing demands on the School must be considered.

6. In view of the above, I recommend:

- a. That the material forwarded under References A and B be returned to the Office of Personnel to be unified so that the Operations School may consider each position in its entirety (i.e. the description, the qualification requirements, and the resulting grade structure), and all positions together.
- b. That the above exercise be accomplished as described in Reference C, including the figure annexed thereto.
- c. Alternative to the above, that this entire exercise now be questioned as worthwhile to undertake at all.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Chief, Operations School/TR**SECRET**